

Appl. No. 10/710,439  
Amdt. dated March 20, 2006  
Reply to Office action of December 28, 2005

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Objection to the drawings:

The drawing figure 6 is objected to because it includes the reference character (52) not mentioned in the description.

5

**Response:**

Paragraph 0018 of the specification has been amended to add the reference character 52 to the two vertical shafts 52. No new matter is added through this amendment to the specification.

10

2. Objection to the specification:

The disclosure is objected to due to an informality in paragraph 0017 of the specification.

15

**Response:**

Paragraph 0017 of the specification has been amended as shown above. Acceptance of the amended specification is respectfully requested.

3. Objection to claim 3:

20

Claim 3 is objected to due to an informality. In claim 3, the term "an lower" should be changed to --a lower--. Appropriate correction is required.

**Response:**

25

Claim 3 has been amended to correct this informality. Acceptance of the amended claim 3 is respectfully requested.

4. Rejection of claims 1 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b):

Appl. No. 10/710,439  
Amdt. dated March 20, 2006  
Reply to Office action of December 28, 2005

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Murase et al.

**Response:**

5           Claim 1 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Claim 1 now contains limitations previously found in original claim 3. None of the cited prior art references teach a backlight display panel in which the upper housing has an upper base and an upper cover installed on the upper base in a rotatable manner, and that the and the upper cover is capable of clipping the  
10           transparent film on the first plane of the light guide plate. Therefore, the amended claim 1 should be allowable over the cited prior art. Claim 4 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1 and 4 is respectfully requested.

15   5. Rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Velez and Nakayama et al.

**Response:**

20           As stated above, claim 1 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Claim 1 now contains limitations previously found in original claim 3. None of the cited prior art references teach a backlight display panel in which the upper housing has an upper base and an upper cover installed on the upper base in a rotatable manner, and that the and the upper cover is capable of clipping the  
25           transparent film on the first plane of the light guide plate. Therefore, the amended claim 1 should be allowable over the cited prior art. Claims 2, 4, and 5 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 is

Appl. No. 10/710,439  
Amdt. dated March 20, 2006  
Reply to Office action of December 28, 2005

respectfully requested.


6. Amendment to claim 3:

5 Claim 3 has been amended to move references to the upper housing into claim 1  
and to keep all other references to the lower housing in claim 3. Claim 3 had been  
indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form.

In view of the above amendments to the claims, the applicant respectfully requests  
that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

10

Sincerely yours,



Date: 03.20.2006

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

15 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

20 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C.  
is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)